



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/538,996	03/30/2000	Jen-Shou Tseng	JCLA5261	8596

7590 01/15/2003
J C Patents Inc
4 VENTURE
SUITE 250
Irvine, CA 92618

EXAMINER

SAFAIPOUR, HOUSHANG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/538,996

Applicant(s)

TSENG, JEN-SHOU

Examiner

Houshang Safaipoor

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernasconi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,063), and further in view of Miamoto Junzo (Patent No. JP361026039A).

Regarding claim 1, Bernasconi et al. discloses an installation on a scanner for increasing a scanning range along an axial direction of a light source, comprising: a light source having a light axis, wherein the light source provides a light beam necessary for scanning a document (fig. 2A, light source 222, col. 9, lines 13-19); and

a transparent glass panel for holding the document and permitting passage of light from the light source so that a scan image of the document can be ultimately obtained (transparent surface 106, col. 5, lines 3-9). Bernasconi et al. does not explicitly disclose that the transparent glass panel has a coating thereon for lowering light transparency near mid-portion of the light axis relative to either end of the light axis. Miamoto discloses a platen 3 with coating, and parts of the coating corresponding to the corner parts C of platen 3 are peeled (fig. 1, page 1, constitution). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Miamoto's platen in Bernasconi's scanning device, because the use of a platen with the described coating would equalize the quantity of light

irritated from the corners with that from other parts of the platen and results in improvement in the quality of the scanned image.

Regarding claim 2, Bernasconi et al. does not explicitly disclose a plurality of coating material, each having a different light transparency. Miamoto discloses a platen 3 with coating layers 8 and 9 as illustrated in fig. 1. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Miamoto's platen in Bernasconi's scanning device, because the use of a platen with the described coating would improve the quality of the scanned image.

Regarding claim 4, Bernasconi et al. discloses the installation of claim 1, wherein the scan image is formed by light provided by the light source on reflecting from the document (fig. 2A, reflective document 102, illumination system 222, col. 5, lines 30-32).

Regarding claim 5, Bernasconi et al. discloses the installation of claim 1, wherein the scan image is formed by light provided by the light source on passing through the document (fig. 2B, transparent original 124, illumination system 222, col. 5, lines 60-66).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, the arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 2 are applicable to claims 10 and 11 respectively.

Claims 3, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernasconi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,063), and further in view of Takase et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,463,229).

Regarding claim 3, Bernasconi et al. does not explicitly disclose the installation of claim 1, wherein the coating is formed using a single layer of coating material but having a variable thickness across the transparent glass panel. Takase et al. discloses an image input terminal with

Art Unit: 2622

shading layer 53 with variable thickness as illustrated in fig. 1. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Takase's platen in Bernasconi's scanning device, because the use of a platen with the described coating would improve the quality of the scanned image.

Regarding claim 6, Bernasconi et al. does not explicitly disclose the installation of claim 5, wherein an additional second transparent Glass panel is inserted between the document and the light source. Takase et al. discloses an image input terminal with transparent conductive layer 57 as illustrated in fig. 1. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Takase's platen in Bernasconi's scanning device, because the use of a platen with the described coating would improve the quality of the scanned image.

Regarding claim 12, the arguments analogous to those presented for claims 3 are applicable to claim 12.

Allowable Subject Matter


Claims 7-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Houshang Safaipoor whose telephone number is (703)306-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles, Sr. can be reached on (703)305-4712. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-0377.

 Houshang Safaipoor
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2622
January 4, 2003


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600